AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111 Attorney Docket No.: Q67364

Application No.: 10/046,078

REMARKS

Claims 1-17 have been examined. With this amendment, Applicants add claims 18-23.

Claims 1-23 are all the claims pending in the application.

1. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 9, 11, 12, 14 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as

being anticipated by AAPA. For at least the following reason, Applicants traverse the rejection.

Claim 1 recites an apparatus for recording a two-dimensional image that comprises a

"means for recording an image...in at least one of an accelerating period...and a decelerating

period." The Examiner alleges that the start of the exposure process by starting the drum in step

S2A in Figure 22 corresponds to this feature.

Applicants submit that Figure 22 clearly shows that the recording of the image itself (step

S2F- EXPOSE PRINTING PLATE) is only done when the rotation of the drum is stable (i.e.,

constant speed). Therefore, the AAPA does not disclose or even remotely suggest "recording an

image" while in an acceleration period or a deceleration period of the drum as set forth in the

claimed combination.

Because independent claims 11 and 14 recite similar features as claim 1, Applicants

submit that these claims are patentable for at least the reason given above.

Because claims 9, 12, and 17 depend on independent claims 1, 11, and 14 respectively,

Applicants submit that these claims are patentable at least by virtue of their respective

dependencies.

10

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111 Attorney Docket No.: Q67364

Application No.: 10/046,078

2. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 10 and 13 as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of

Johnson et al. (US 5,889,534) ["Johnson"]. Applicants traverse the rejection.

Because claims 10 and 13 depend on independent claims 1 and 13 respectively, and

Johnson does not cure the deficient teaching of AAPA with respect to claims 1 and 11,

Applicants submit that claims 10 and 13 are patentable at least by virtue of their respective

dependencies.

3. Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants thank the Examiner for finding that claims 2-8 are allowable over the prior

art.

Applicants thank the Examiner for finding allowable subject matter in claims 15 and 16

and indicating that they would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicants hold

rewriting claims 15 and 16 in abeyance until the matter regarding their base claim is resolved.

In the reasons for allowance of claims 2-8, the Examiner only cites some features found

in independent claim 2. Applicants submit that claims 2-8 are allowable by virtue of the features

recited therein.

4. New Claims

With this amendment, Applicants add claims 18 to 23. Applicants submit that these

claims are patentable at least by virtue of their respective dependencies, as well as the features

set forth therein.

11

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111

Application No.: 10/046,078

Attorney Docket No.: Q67364

5. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed

to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is

kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue

Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any

overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

Registration No. 54,627

Bhaskar Kakarla

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC

Telephone: (202) 293-7060

Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: April 20, 2004

12